

Application No. 10/015,613

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
SEP 13 2006

REMARKS

The Office Action of March 13, 2006 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1 - 27 are pending in this application. Of these, claims 1, 11, and 22 are independent. In this Amendment, claims 1-3, 7, 11, 19, and 22 -24 have been amended, no claims have been cancelled, and no claims have been added.

Claim Objections

Claim 11 has been objected to because due to an informality in line 9. The informality in line 9 has been corrected in the claim amendments above. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for his diligence in reading the claims and pointing out the informality which was an inadvertent typographical error. Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to Claim 11 be removed.

35 USC § 112

Claims 7-10 and 19 have been rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph for being indefinite. The claims have been amended to correct the issues identified by the Examiner. Specifically, the language referring to "pixel size" in Claim 7 has been removed and Claim 19 has been amended to be dependent upon Claim 17 instead of Claim 16. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for his diligence in reading the claims. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections to Claims 7-10 and 19 be removed.

Application No. 10/015,613

35 USC § 102

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-12, 14-19, 22-23 and 25-27 have been rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Seidensticker, US Patent No. 5,920,327.

The disclosures of the cited art and the distinctions between them may be briefly summarized as follows:

Seidensticker discloses a multiple resolution data display wherein a large set of image data is mapped onto a much smaller single physical display device wherein a portion of the single physical display device is used to display the image data at a 1:1 resolution and other portions of the single physical display device used to represent some fraction of the remaining data at a lower resolution. This is accomplished by modifying and removing some data such that the remaining data can be displayed on the single display device.

Applicant's claimed invention, as described in amended independent claims 1 and 11 comprises at least two physical display devices where each display device has a display area having the following characteristics: the first display area has a first display resolution and a first boundary, the second display area has a second display resolution different from the first display resolution and a second boundary. Each display device also has an associated image processor from which it receives image information data for display on the display area. The first and second display areas are so constructed and arranged such that when an image is displayed on at least a portion of each of the first and second display areas utilizing the image information data supplied by the associated image processors the resulting

Application No. 10/015,613

displayed image appears to be substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the image and the displayed resolution of the portion of the image displayed on the first display is different than the displayed resolution of the portion of the image displayed on the second display.

Applicant's claimed invention as described in independent claim 22 comprises means for displaying a first image on a first display device in a first display area having a first display resolution and a first boundary, means for displaying a second image in a second display area having a second display resolution, wherein the second display resolution is different from the first display resolution, and a second boundary, and the first and second display means being so constructed and arranged such that when a combined image comprising at least a portion of the first image displayed in the first display area and at least a portion of the second image displayed in the second display area is displayed the resulting combined image appears to be substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the image and the displayed resolution of the first image is different than the displayed resolution of the second image.

To summarize, Seidensticker describes a process for taking image data which is too large to display on a single display and modifying or reducing that image data such that it can be displayed on a single display as a single image. Applicant's claimed invention is a display having two display devices, each display device having display areas with different resolutions and different boundaries wherein when one or more images are displayed across the display areas on the separate display devices they appear to be substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the images and the displayed resolutions of the portions of the displayed images in the different display areas is different.

Application No. 10/015,613.

A claim or claims rejected under 35 USC § 102 is anticipated by the reference. For anticipation under 35 USC § 102, the claim must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present (MPEP 706.02).

Seidensticker does not teach, disclose or suggest using multiple display devices. Seidensticker is concerned with the problem of how to display image data on a single display device where the image data is too large to be displayed in its entirety on the single display device. Therefore, in order to display the image data on the single display device Seidensticker must modify and delete data so that the image data is can be displayed on the single display device. In order to maintain some portion of the image data in its entirety, Seidensticker selects a portion of the display device used for full scale display of the data and reduces the data outside of this portion for reduced display of the data resulting in a display of a distorted and/or low resolution image.

In summary, Seidensticker does not teach or suggest at least two display devices where each display device has a display area wherein the resolution of at least one of the display areas is different than the resolution of at least one of the other display areas, and wherein when an image is displayed across the display areas it appears substantially continuous to a viewer with the portions of the image on each of the display areas being displayed in different resolutions either explicitly or impliedly. Therefore Applicant believes the requirements for the rejection are not met, that independent claims 1, 11, and 22 are in a condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the rejection be removed.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Application No. 10/015,613

SEP 13 2006

Claims 2, 4-8, 10, 12, 14-19, 23 and 25-27 are also rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Seidensticker.

In either case, claims 2, 4-8, 10, are dependent upon Claim 1, claims 12 and 14-19 are dependent upon claim 11, and claims 23 and 25-27 are dependent upon claim 22. As these claims are all dependent claims upon independent claims 1, 11 or 22 and insofar as these claims are concerned, they all include the limitations of and depend from one of now presumably allowable claims 1, 11, or 22 and they are also believed to be in allowable condition for the reasons hereinbefore discussed with regard to independent claims 1, 11, or 22.

35 USC § 103

Claims 3, 13, and 24 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidensticker.

The disclosures of the cited art and the distinctions between them may be briefly summarized as follows:

Seidensticker discloses a multiple resolution data display wherein a large set of image data is mapped onto a much smaller single physical display device wherein a portion of the single physical display device is used to display the image data at a 1:1 resolution and other portions of the single physical display device used to represent some fraction of the remaining data at a lower resolution. This is accomplished by modifying and removing some data such that the remaining data can be displayed on the single display device.

Application No. 10/015,613

Applicant's claimed invention, as described in dependent claims 3, 13, and 24 comprises at least two physical display devices where each display device has a display area having the following characteristics: the first display area has a first display resolution and a first boundary, the second display area has a second display resolution different from the first display resolution and a second boundary. Each display device also has an associated image processor. The first and second display areas are so constructed and arranged such that when an image is displayed on at least a portion of each of the first and second display areas utilizing the image information data supplied by the associated image processors the resulting displayed image appears to be substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the image and the displayed resolution of the portion of the image displayed on the first display is different than the displayed resolution of the portion of the image displayed on the second display. One of the displays is a projector and projection surface.

The Office Action cites Seidensticker for all the limitations of independent claims 1, 11, and 22 and takes Official Notice for the specific dependencies listed in claims 3, 13, and 24, i.e. one of the display devices is a projector and projection area. As discussed above, Seidensticker does not teach or suggest at least two display devices where each display device has a display area with differing resolutions wherein when an image is displayed across the display areas it appears substantially continuous to a viewer with the portions of the image on each of the display areas being displayed in different resolutions either explicitly or impliedly as claimed in claims 1, 11, and 22, nor are any of the features of the claimed invention inherently present.

Application No. 10/015,613

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure.

It is well settled that the prior art must enable one skilled in the art to make and use the apparatus or method and that obviousness also requires evidence that the prior art as a whole would have enabled someone of ordinary skill to practice the claimed invention. Seidensticker does not teach or suggest two display devices wherein each display device has a display area with different resolutions and different boundaries and wherein when one or more images are displayed across the display areas they appear to be substantially continuous to a viewer but the portions of the displayed image displayed on the different display area are displayed in different resolutions. Therefore, as the references do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, there is no suggestion or motivation to modify the references to obtain applicant's claimed invention and there is no reasonable expectation of success. Applicant therefore believes that the claims 3, 13, and 24 are in a condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the rejection be removed.

Claims 9, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidensticker in view of Duchowski.

Application No. 10/015,613

As stated above, Seidensticker discloses a multiple resolution data display wherein a large set of image data is mapped onto a much smaller single physical display device wherein a portion of the single physical display device is used to display the image data at a 1:1 resolution and other portions of the single physical display device used to represent some fraction of the remaining data at a lower resolution. This is accomplished by modifying and removing some data such that the remaining data can be displayed on the single display device.

Duchowski discloses a multiresolution image representation method matching human visual system spatial acuity within multiple regions of interest. Regions of interest are maintained at high (original resolution) while peripheral areas are degraded for display on a single display device.

Applicant's claimed invention, as described in dependent claims 9, 20, and 21 comprises three physical display devices where each display device has a display area having the following characteristics: the first display area has a first display resolution and a first boundary, the second display area has a second display resolution and a second boundary, the third display area has a third display resolution and a third boundary where at least one of the display resolutions is different from at least one other of the display resolutions. Each display device also has an associated image processor. The first and second display areas are so constructed and arranged such that when an image is displayed on at least a portion of each of the first and second display areas utilizing the image information data supplied by the associated image processors the resulting displayed image appears to be substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the image and the displayed resolution of the portion of the image displayed on the first display is different than the displayed resolution of the portion of the image displayed on

Application No. 10/015,613

the second display. The three display areas are arranged such that one of the display areas surrounds the other two display areas and the two surrounded display areas are spaced apart.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure.

It is well settled that the prior art must enable one skilled in the art to make and use the apparatus or method and that obviousness also requires evidence that the prior art as a whole would have enabled someone of ordinary skill to practice the claimed invention. Seidensticker does not teach or suggest two display devices wherein each display device has a display area with different resolutions and different boundaries and wherein when one or more images are displayed across the display areas they appear to be substantially continuous to a viewer but the portions of the displayed image displayed on the different display area are displayed in different resolutions. Neither does Duchowski not teach or suggest two display devices wherein each display device has a display area with different resolutions and different boundaries and wherein when one or more images are displayed across the display areas they appear to be substantially continuous to a viewer but the portions of the displayed image displayed on the different display area are displayed in different resolutions. Therefore, as the references do not teach

Application No. 10/015,613

or suggest all of the claim limitations, there is no suggestion or motivation to modify the references to obtain applicant's claimed invention and there is no reasonable expectation of success. Applicant therefore believes that the claims 9, 20, and 21 are in a condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the rejection be removed.

Reconsideration/Admittance Requested

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, reconsideration of this application and allowance thereof are earnestly solicited.

Fee Authorization And Extension Of Time Statement

A three month extension of time is believed to be required for this amendment, however, the undersigned Xerox Corporation attorney (or agent) hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Nola Mae McBain, at Telephone Number 650-812-4264, Palo Alto, California.

Respectfully submitted,



Nola Mae McBain
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 35,782
(650) 812-4264

Date: September 13, 2006